

Route 28 Station – South Study Meeting Notes

Working Group Meeting #23

L.L. Coates ES library @ 7 PM, Wednesday 04-03-13

Administrative Items:

- Chairman Jeff Fairfield opens meeting by deferring vote on the previous meeting's summary draft (02-20-13) to allow Work Group (WG) members time to review the documents since it was not distributed prior to this evening's meeting.

Draft Plan Text: Jeff leads the group in a discussion of the draft Plan text dated 03-29-13. See the following link for draft Plan text:

http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/draft_plan_text_3_29_13.pdf

See the following link for proposed Land Units map:

http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/proposed_land_units_map.pdf

The WG was able to discuss and agree upon language in the draft's land use section, with the several exceptions noted below.

Discussion:

- **Planned Development Potential Table** (p.2): Jeff comments that the JLB Realty letter from Shane Murphy (shared at the February 20th WG meeting) points out that this particular parcel is zoned I-4 and could develop with industrial uses. The table doesn't reflect this though.
 - Sterling Wheeler, Department of Planning and Zoning, replies that much of the land in Land Unit A is zoned for industrial use. While this means it is possible for these parcels to develop with industrial uses, the Plan assumes a different mix of uses. The table reflects the planned uses in this area.
- **Parcel Consolidation & Coordinated Development Plans** (p. 2-3): WG member Bob Lawrence expresses concern that these two land use guidelines only allow development proposals that include multiple parcels or are coordinated with other development proposals. He says this would exclude individual parcels from developing on their own.
 - Staff indicated that this wasn't the intention and would look to revise the wording to make that clear.
- **Affordable & Workforce Housing** (p. 3): Several WG members raise questions about this land use guideline, including why staff feels the need to require more than the current County-wide policy of 12% Workforce Dwelling Units (WDU).
 - WG member Greg Riegle also suggests the proposed percentages of WDU's are arbitrary.
 - WG member Rae Noritake cautions that too many requirements on development within the TOD area may preclude the type of development we are seeking for the area, leading to by-right development that fails to create the mixed-use and activated pedestrian environment that we desire.

- WG member Sarah Newman points out that workforce housing is a huge need for the County, especially for the mixed-use, TOD areas that will have convenient access to transit. She suggests we be forward-thinking.
- Jeff questions why we need specific percentages above the County-wide policy. He suggests we consider his Plan language that would require a higher percentage of WDU's but is more general and doesn't include exact percentages.
- Rae asks what the current percentage or number of residential units within the Land Unit A are (or have been committed as) WDU's.
- Sarah moves that the WG defer consideration of this issue until staff can provide more information on existing WDU's in Land Unit A or the larger general area. We need this information to better consider the impacts of this proposed requirement.
 - The move was seconded and approved by the group.
- **TOD District Intensity / Special Exception (p.3-4):** Jeff expresses his concern, shared by several other WG members, that this land use guideline is addressing issues more appropriately addressed during the zoning process.
 - Rae doesn't like the guideline because he wants to encourage rather than discourage development within the TOD area.
 - Jeff moves to remove this land use guideline from the proposed Plan.
 - The move was seconded and approved by the group.
- **LAND UNIT A-1 Intensity Tier Splitting Development Proposals (p.4):** WG member Mike Romeo mentions that he would like for development proposals that extend beyond any single intensity tier to be allowed to develop at the higher intensity tier. He believes these proposals could work to funnel pedestrians and bicyclists towards the Metro station due to their design, regardless of the intensity tier line representing distance from the station.
 - Staff mentions that this proposed guidance agrees with established practice in other mixed use centers, like Tysons.
- **Tiers 1, 2 and 3 and Support Retail (p. 4-5):** Jeff proposes different language to clarify that we want to encourage the type of retail that will minimize residents' daily reliance on the automobile. This would be applicable to the last sentence of each tier's guidance.
 - Mike adds that we should include retail uses beyond just support retail. This would include anchors, such as a grocery store.
- **Land Unit A-2 Cemeteries (p. 5):** WG member Jean Saylor notes that this land unit includes several cemeteries. This should be reflected in the language for the land unit.
- **Land Unit A-3 Multipurpose Trails (p.5):** WG member Tom Gilmore wants to include bicycles to guidance regarding improving north-south pedestrian connectivity.
 - Staff agrees to replace "pedestrian paths" with "multipurpose trails" which include pedestrians and bicyclists.
- **Land Unit A-5 (p. 6-7):** Greg expresses some concern about retaining the additional conditions for the land unit. He wants to treat the land unit in the same way that the other land units are treated.

- Greg introduces his client, Jeremy from Clark Realty Partners, the owner of 40 acres of land within the land unit, west of Sunrise Valley Drive. Jeremy expresses his concern with the Transportation section's (which is not being reviewed this evening) conceptual street network distributed at the February 20th WG meeting. He is particularly concerned with a new street on the map, cutting across his property within Land Unit A-5 from the northwest to the southeast, connecting into an extended River Birch Road. He has submitted site plans to the County and this new street doesn't fit within the design of the site plan.
 - Sterling suggests staff address this potential conflict by adding language for the land unit that requires inter-parcel access for vehicles.
- Greg wants the property to develop as a mixed-use, TOD development. The current Plan text, it is implied, would only encourage the property to develop as a by-right office use with minimal commitments from the developer.
 - Tom expresses concern about characterizing any development within the land unit as "TOD". The land unit is a mile away from the station and outside of the designated TOD area.
 - Tom also expresses concern with allowing residential within the land unit due to its potential effect on schools. He mentions that many properties within the area have rezoned from office use to residential. He would rather see office uses than residential.
 - Sterling notes that the proposed mix of uses for the land unit are in accordance with what we analyzed, including impacts to schools.
- Sterling suggests that since the land unit is abutting existing townhouses and single family detached units, we should add a little more specific language for this land unit about building heights. It would provide more detailed guidance than the Areawide Urban Design guidance on building height.
- Greg moves that the WG adopt the staff recommendation for the land unit at the bottom of page 7. More specifically, he mentions retaining the first paragraph of the current text and removing all the rest. Any issues with respect to transportation and building height and design should be deferred for later discussion.
 - The motion is seconded and is then opened for discussion.
 - Tom expresses concern about striking the third bullet on bulk and mass near adjacent residential. He also believes that residential in Land Unit A-5 will impact schools differently than development in Land Unit A-1.
 - The motion is passed by all present members, with Tom opposing.

Next Meeting Date: 04-16-13 (Tuesday) @ 7:00 PM in the library. WG will hear from Fairfax County Department of Transportation about the transportation analysis of land use scenario "G". The group will also discuss the draft Plan text's transportation section. A second WG meeting was set for 04-30-13 (Tuesday) @ 7:00 PM in the library.